

RIGH

Bish

OF

No. II.

REPLY

TO A

SECOND LETTER

OF THE

RIGHT REV'D. THE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL,
And Metropolitan of Canada,

ADDRESSED TO THE

Bishops and Clergy of the United Church of England
and Ireland in Canada.

BY

I. HELLMUTH, D. D.,

ARCHDEACON OF HURON AND ASST. MINISTER OF ST. PAUL'S
CATHEDRAL, LONDON, C. W.

TO WHICH IS APPENDED

“THE SECOND LETTER”

OF THE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL.

QUEBEC:
PRINTED AT THE CANADA GAZETTE OFFICE.

1862.

R E P L Y

TO A

“SECOND LETTER”

OF THE

RIGHT REV'D. THE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL,

Quebec, June 12, 1862.

MY LORD BISHOP,

When I completed the painful task of refuting the charges and insinuations with which your Lordship thought proper to asperse my character, and to impute to me motives and actions derogatory to my professional status in Society, I had hopes that, to a certain extent at least, you would have been led to acknowledge that you had been mistaken in your estimate of my motives and actions ; and judging by the precepts of that Go-pel which inculcate not less imperatively the abnegation of self than the recognition of the rights of others, I had a right to expect that when I had opposed your surmises and dubious statements against me, with documentary evidence, which could not be gainsayed, that I should be free from further molestation.

But your Lordship has seen fit to issue another Pastoral to your Bishops and Clergy, to which I feel myself compelled to reply.

Along with this answer I published your “second letter,” adopting the same plan as I did with the first, for the simple object that the whole controversy should be before the public, that all who read may judge from *facts* as they really are,

and thus be enabled to give their verdict from a perfect data.

If I express myself with perfect freedom and plainness of speech, I trust your Lordship will not interpret it as a want of respect, but as necessary for the protection of my character which you have used your utmost efforts, both in private and in public, to damage and to ruin.

I again respectfully submit that no controversy can justify the course your Lordship has adopted, and into which no one simply anxious to vindicate the truth would enter.

If your Lordship was simply anxious for the cause of truth, why, before appearing as my public accuser and defamer, did you not demand such reparation as the case might have required ? and had I been convinced that what I stated at the Islington Meeting was not in unison with truth, none would have been more ready publicly to retract than myself. But this would not have answered your Lordship's aim ; and in your eagerness to destroy the man who is evidently in your way, your Lordship assumes a divine prerogative, pronouncing "ex-cathedra" as Metropolitan, before the church and the world, that I am influenced in all my labours by the worst of motives, and that my statements therefore are not to be depended upon.

Not only is such a course contrary to the plain precepts of the Gospel, but it is also condemned by the ordinary rules which guide men of the world.

The first point to which I shall advert is on page 1 of your Lordship's "second letter," (alluding to the Metropolitan Patent) :

"I can truly say that in the first place I have always wished for free and open discussion whether on that" (i. e. the Patent) "or any other public measures."

I should not have taken notice of this, in any way, had not more than one of the Quebec Delegates to the Provincial Synod directed my attention to this passage, as not being in unison with what we experienced when we met your Lordship more than a year ago, at the residence of the Bishop of Quebec. When some of us stated to your Lordship that we thought the powers in the Patent were excessive, and would be objected to

fect
s of
want
acter
ivate
stify
h no
ruth,
mer,
ight
ated
none
self.
and
y in
pro-
church
y the
not to
of the
which
"your
olitan
rished
(patent)
d not
incial
ng in
ldship
ebec.
nt the
ed to

and discussed in the Synod, you distinctly expressed your dis-
approval of such a course, and said that you hoped the Patent
would not be discussed in Synod; that it was not sent for criticism
but for the correction of a mere clerical error, and that it was a
voluntary act on your Lordship's part, to bring the subject
at all before us. For the truth of this, I appeal to *all* who
met your Lordship on that occasion. So much, my Lord, as to
"your wish for free and open discussion," at least on the
Metropolitan Patent.

It was only at the meeting of the Synod of the Diocese of
Montreal, some time afterwards, that it became known that
your Lordship had distinct and positive instructions from the
Colonial Secretary to submit the patent to the Bishops and
others interested in the other Dioceses for their opinion and
suggestions. This unexpected information produced much
surprise, and was publicly alluded to in a letter by the Bishop
of Huron, as the members of the Church, in his diocese, and
elsewhere, would, in all probability, had the desire of the Colonial
Secretary been known at an earlier date, have addressed them-
selves by petition to the Queen against the extraordinary
powers conferred by the Patent. The Universal dissatisfaction
caused by the authority conveyed in that instrument induced
your Lordship to alter your course, and concur in its alteration,
but you had in the meantime (am I not warranted in using the
term you have applied to me?) *astutely* claimed and obtained
some credit for doing *spontaneously* what the instructions of
the Imperial Government made it impossible for you to avoid.

Your Lordship, in the same page, seeks to reconcile your
public acts of approval of my character for eleven years, *after*
you had found me out, by the simple remark that "the erec-
tion of the Church was of a private nature." And yet it was
by that very transaction your Lordship discovered me to be
"*a designing and deceitful man*"; that you had "*no confidence*
in my truth and integrity"; that I had "*manœuvred and*
attempted to take you in"; that I "*conspired with Genl. Evans*
to entrap you," &c., &c."

My Lord what more frightful crimes, I would ask, can a
Minister of the Gospel be guilty of?

Believing, as your Lordship did, all this, and becoming more and more confirmed in this opinion of me, "the more you observed my course," why did not your Lordship reprove me, even in private, with a christian admonition? But instead of this, during eleven subsequent years, your Lordship becomes a prominent party in assigning to me places of honor, responsibility and influence, some of them in your own Diocese.

And now because I have said in England that the teaching of Trinity College, Toronto, is unsound, and that "Evangelical men" as such, are few in number "in the B. N. A. Colonies generally,"—facts which your Lordship has not even attempted to disprove,—your Lordship, as Metropolitan, denounces me, in no measured terms, to your Bishops and Clergy, and before the world at large, as a man, whose testimony cannot be relied upon.

May I not be permitted to ask the question you put to me:—
"How are these matters to be reconciled?"

Your Lordship, in both your letters, asserts that I have made an "attack upon the Canadian Church and Canadian Institutions" and in that to Mr. Crooks, that I have made a "violent attack." Twice I have distinctly stated that I did no such thing.

In my speech at Islington, I referred only to Trinity College, Toronto—the teaching of which I believed, with my own Bishop and many others, to be highly dangerous to our Protestant Church,—why not prove me wrong in this, instead of defaming my character and avoiding the question? Again, in my statement at that meeting as to "the paucity of Evangelical Clergymen in the British N. A. Colonies generally," why, instead of impugning my motives, does not Your Lordship attempt to prove me incorrect on this head also? But the truth is, your Lordship cannot disprove these things, hence the course you have seen fit to adopt to destroy the man who is bold enough to speak out fearlessly his opinions.

But, My Lord, have you not said more as to the paucity of "Evangelical men" in Canada, than I have ever ventured to say? As examples of encouragement held out to "Evangelical men" in Canada, your lordship has specified places in the Pro-

vince, saying: "Evangelical men, as such, may not be as abundant as the Archdeacon wishes, yet he will allow they are to be found in many most important places. The Cathedral at Toronto and all the churches at Kingston have long been so filled, that at London, three in Montreal, one in Quebec, one in Hamilton, all principal cities in the Province. But whether the clergy generally come up to the mark as "Evangelical men" or not, I say it is a positive misrepresentation of the fact."

You assign thus to the most populous protestant city in Canada, viz: Toronto, where there are 22 Clergymen, 3 Evangelical men,—all on the Cathedral staff; to the city of Montreal, where there are 12 or 13 Clergymen, you assign three; to the city of Quebec, where there are 12 Clergymen, your Lordship assigns *one*, &c. &c. &c. This is your Lordship's own estimate, and yet you say that my statement in England "is a misrepresentation of the fact," of what? That Trinity College, Toronto, is not in its teaching dangerous? And that Evangelical men, as such, are not in a minority?

Does it not occur to Your Lordship that it would be at once more just and honorable, to meet the question openly and fairly? Should Your Lordship show by arguments, founded on undeniable facts, that what I have stated is not correct, none will be more ready publicly to retract what I have said on this head, than I.

My Lord, it is no small comfort to me in this severe trial, to have had it in my power, by undeniable facts and documentary evidences, to clear myself from every charge and insinuation which you have seen fit to publish against my character.

You again try in your "second letter" to make the most of the "Sherbrooke Street Church,"—reiterating the same story, as in the first.

Your Lordship evidently begins to see the mistake you have made in charging an old distinguished General Officer, well known for his scrupulous integrity, with a "manoeuvre, and an attempt to take you in;" with "conspiring to entrap you," &c., &c. And although it is perfectly clear from your first letter that General Evans is included in these grave charges, you feel

compelled to retract to a certain extent, as far as he is concerned, still leaving them upon me.

In order to extricate yourself from this difficulty, your Lordship is obliged not only to withdraw what you have written, but to deny the accuracy of the Bishop of Huron's statement in his letter to me.

In your eagerness, my Lord, to accomplish the one thing—to blast my reputation—you gave utterance to things which you now see cause to regret.

It is not likely the Bishop of Huron would give any other than the correct version of your charges against General Evans and myself. Your Lordship spoke no doubt warmly; the Bishop of Huron listened calmly and thoughtfully.

The Bishop of Huron carefully wrote down what you said to him in Kingston regarding the Sherbrooke Street Church; and his language is *positive* and *distinct* in the following words:—"He" [that is Your Lordship] "had seen through "the trap which was thus laid for him, and discovered that "Genl. Evans and Dr. Hellmuth had conspired to obtain "from him his consent to a measure which was only intended "to enhance the value of Genl. Evans' property, and to obtain "a church in this city for his son-in-law; but which would in "the end prove highly injurious to the Church:"

Any one comparing this with Your Lordship's own statement on this head, on pages 10 and 11 of your first letter, would at once see that there is no material difference. Your Lordship, however, now denies the accuracy of the Bishop of Huron's statement, adding that you "certainly did not use any such expression." I have simply quoted *verbatim*, and must leave the matter here.

In Your Lordship's second letter, on page 5, you say:—"I had but one short interview with Genl. Evans, when he certainly declined to give me any statement of his proposal in writing, but I cannot pretend to say that he knew exactly what had been the communication made to me by Dr. Hellmuth."

The reader of this passage can hardly fail to perceive, a distinct insinuation, that not satisfied with deceiving Your

Lordship, I had also been guilty of ~~do~~ 'ving my own father-in-law in relation to this matter. I shall only remark upon this point, that it is difficult to write calmly under such an insult.

It is very strange that your Lordship's memory should be so retentive in some things as to quote with inverted commas or in italics, what was said eleven years ago, while you cannot recollect other circumstances—very important links in the chain of the particular transaction.

Genl. Evans is in full possession of all his faculties with a strikingly clear memory, as all who know him can testify, and he begs me to remind your Lordship of two long interviews with him on the subject of the Church, instead of "*one short one*;" he desires me to call to your recollection that Mrs. Fulford accompanied your Lordship to spend an evening at his residence, Beaver Hall Terrace, when your Lordship, the Genl. and myself, during the evening, fully and freely conversed on the subject in question, and the second interview was on the morning you refer to. I may also state here that prior to my knowing any thing of your Lordship's first "letter," as I was in Upper Canada at the time of its issue, the Genl. gave the same version before Mr. and Mrs. Charles Montizambert and others, as myself, of the circumstances in connection with the Church, by which the Genl. and I abide, notwithstanding your Lordship characterising our account of the matter as "purely imaginary."

On this point, as there are no documents on record, your Lordship appeals to the public in the following words: "I must leave those best acquainted with us both to form their judgment as to what the facts were."

We admit your Lordship stands on vantage ground from the high and sacred office you fill, but the Genl. and myself are quite satisfied to abide the decision of the tribunal you appeal to.

On page 7 your Lordship wishes the public to infer that you have not sought "information against me," and say:

"The Archdeacon complains in connection with a letter from the Bishop of Quebec, published by me, that I had been seeking information against him, while waiting for his reply to my letter to him in England, enquiring as to the truth of the report of his speech at Islington. The fact was that

while I was travelling down from Kingston with the Bishop of Quebec, he spoke of what the Archdeacon was reported to have said respecting the Canadian Colleges; and expressed himself very nearly as given in his letter. All I did was simply to ask whether he had any objection to send me in writing what he had then said, which he said he would do very willingly."

I find it difficult to reconcile this statement with that of the Bishop of Quebec, who, on the contrary says: "The terms of cordial friendship which have subsisted between Dr. Hellmuth and myself, make it *peculiarly distressing to me to comply with your desire for information.*"

You have, my Lord, placed yourself both with the Bishop of Quebec and the Bishop of Huron, in a dilemma. If your Lordship's memory is of such retention that you can *safely* rely upon it, you must of necessity suppose that the Bishop of Quebec has deviated in his letter, from what he said to you in conversation, and that the Bishop of Huron has misrepresented you in the matter of the Sherbrooke street Church.

All this, my Lord, shows the necessity of quoting from documents instead of depending entirely upon memory. And here I would make it a special request, that should your Lordship see fit to issue a third Pastoral on this controversy, that you will do me the justice of quoting from my speech and letters in my own words.

As another of the many illustrations which I might bring forward of the mode in which your Lordship seeks information that might prove detrimental to my character, I append a letter which your Lordship wrote in answer to the very missionary who justly complained of your conduct towards him, and whom, having already wronged, with apparent indifference, you re-open the wound you have inflicted by exposing him again to public gaze in your last letter:

"Montreal, May 13, 1862.

"Rev. Sir,

"I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter and to assure you that nothing was more painful to me in connection with the subject of my letter to the Bishops and Clergy, &c.

Bishop
ported
d ex-
All I
o send
would
of the
terms
n Dr.
to me
hop of
f your
safely
Bishop
said to
s mis-
street
docu-
l here
Lordship
t you
and
bring
ation
nd a
very
wards
ndif-
osing
2.
d to
ction
&c.

" then the necessity I felt of alluding to you in any way. I
" would not for a moment wish to express any opinion on your
" case, and most truly hope that you may overcome the diffi-
" culties in which you have been involved and prove a useful
" minister of the Church. But I did not consider that Arch-
" deacon Hellmuth's conduct first here in regard to your case,
" and while those who acted with him in the C. C. and S. So-
" ciety were still urging your removal, and his voluntary eulogy
" of you in England, was so inconsistent that it most forcibly
" exemplified the manner of his acting. He either behaved
" most unfairly to you here in leaving you in the position he
" did, or he misrepresented the case in —.

" I have been told that the Archdeacon proposed another
" solution of your difficulty to you. That he told you you
" must resign because a promise had been given to certain in-
" fluential parties connected with—that you should do so—but
" that he recommended you to get up a petition from some of
" your congregation to have you re-instated, and then you
" could be reappointed, and all would be settled. *May I ask*
" *you whether this is the fact or not?* as I should not wish to
" have any thing misrepresented.

" I remain, Rev. Sir,
" Your's faithfully,
" (Signed,) F. MONTREAL."

From the very man whom your Lordship unnecessarily
brings before the world, you seek in a most ingenious way to
extract a testimony against me—as having played a double
part—I trust it will be satisfactory to your Lordship to hear
that your enquiry can be distinctly answered in the negative.
If you are not willing to receive my testimony, I refer
you to the Missionary, as I advised him to the very last,
for the reasons already given in my "Reply", to leave his
Mission; and so fully was I persuaded that he would do so,
that I introduced him last September, when in Montreal, to
the Bishop of Huron, whom I requested, if he could, to receive
him in his Diocese. The Missionary being still in his Parish,
I can only conclude that his people who contribute £130 per
annum to his salary, (besides a comfortable parsonage,) wish

him to remain with them, and your Lordship *well knows* that he remains there by the express desire of his Bishop.

Your Lordship remarks on page 7 : " I would ask then why, " as General Superintendent of the Society, he did not take " measures to have the Rev. Mr. _____ restored to his " proper status, before he left Canada ; and whether the other " members of the Society's Committee were not left by him " still seeking to enforce the removal ; and were not a little " embarrassed and surprised, when they read what had oc- " curred at the meeting in England. Perhaps the Archdeacon " knows whether his conduct in this matter has been satisfac- " tory to them."

In reply to this I would observe, that the Rev. Mr. _____ having never been removed from his Mission, it is obvious there was no necessity for restoring him "to his proper status." Since the first of October last my official connection with the Society has ceased, and I have therefore not mixed myself further up with the matter. If my speaking favorably of this young Clergyman, in England, has caused any dissatisfaction to friends whom I esteem, I should of course regret it, but they will, I feel assured, give me credit for sincerity in what I said.

In bringing this letter to a close I can truly say that none can be more anxious for peace than myself, but I will never purchase it at the cost of truth, nor at the sacrifice of my character, which is as dear to me as my very life.

Your Lordship not satisfied with sending your Pastoral to your Bishops and Clergy in Canada, to whom alone it professes to be addressed, has sent it to the leading laity in this Province, and to England also, and caused it to be reprinted *in extenso*, in some of the Church newspapers in this country, in the United States and in Nova Scotia. It is also offered for sale in the book stores, and I have just heard that your Lordship has sent a good supply of the *Pastoral* into my own Parish to be sold for 5 cents a copy.

If this does not evince a determination to persecute and destroy my character, as far as your Lordship's influence can effect it, I do not know what more you can do, and yet on page four you say : " I never had any ill will to Dr. Hell- muth, or wished to injure his position elsewhere."

If I spread my answers as widely as I can, I am only in self defence following your Lordship's example.

If, in the course of this correspondence, I have expressed myself strongly, it is to be attributed entirely to the course which Your Lordship has pursued.

Whilst Your Lordship's proceedings against me are most trying, and calculated to mar the peace and happiness of my family, it might have proved ruinous to me, as a Minister of the Gospel, had I not been better known, and able, by documentary evidences, to prove how futile and groundless are *all* and every one of your accusations and insinuations against my character and motives.

Most deeply do I regret the necessity which Your Lordship has forced upon me to reply thus in self-defence. Nothing but the vindication of my character as a man, a christian and a Minister in the Church of God, would have induced me to write as Your Lordship compels me to do. My reliance is upon Him who judgeth righteously, and who, I am confident, will uphold and sustain me in this hour of trial, and by whose grace, I trust, I shall be enabled through good and through evil report, to discharge my duties as a faithful servant of Christ.

I remain, my Lord Bishop,
Your Lordship's
Obedient servant,

J. HELLMUTH.

The Right Reverend
THE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL
AND METROPOLITAN.

LETTER.

SEE HOUSE,

Montreal, June 5th, 1862.

RIGHT REV. AND REV. BRETHREN,

I have just received a reply from Archdeacon Hellmuth to a letter lately addressed by me to you, respecting certain statements made by him while in England. There are some parts of it on which I wish to make a few remarks. The Archdeacon having first given his version of what occurred on the occasion of the proposal made to me for the erection of a new Church in this City, goes on to enumerate certain subsequent acts of mine, which he says justified him in believing that I could have entertained no reason to condemn his conduct in that matter; and that he and his friend supposed that it was now brought forward again because I had taken umbrage at the opposition made by him to the powers which were intended to be vested in me by my original patent as Metropolitan. In answer to this I can truly say that in the first place I have always wished for free and open discussion, whether on that or any other public measures; and that I have never for an instant harboured any ill-will against any one for the honest and fair expression of his opinions; and having had every reason to be more than satisfied at the manner in which the discussions on that particular subject were conducted, and with the results arrived at, it has not occurred to me to think unkindly of any thing that took place in connection therewith.

Then as to any subsequent acts implying approval. The communication respecting the erection of the Church was of a private nature; and would never have been made public at all, unless it had become known at first through the Archdeacon and his friends. I certainly most entirely believed that it was an unfair attempt to hurry me into an approval of a proposition of the terms of which I had not at the time been properly informed: and from that time I was anxious not to admit the Archdeacon into this Diocese, or to let him interfere in its concerns. But I never had any ill-will to Dr. Hellmuth, or wished to injure his position elsewhere. Nor should I have brought forward the subject in the way

I have now done had not the occasion appeared to me to justify my stating, why previously I had objected to his being connected with the Diocese, and why I thought his present sweeping attack on the clergy and ecclesiastical Institutions of Canada, did not come most appropriately from him. For the same reason when objection was made to his being appointed General Superintendent of the Colonial Church and School Society in British North America, though all the members of the Montreal Committee were perfectly cognizant of my feelings on the subject in regard to Dr. Hellmuth, I was satisfied, without officially and specifically pressing them, on finding, for other reasons stated by the Committee during my absence from home, that the Diocese of Montreal was to be excepted from his charge. It was distinctly known to the members of the Committee that I should not have continued to act with them, had it been otherwise arranged. The Archdeacon, however, alleges in his favor that two years afterwards he was appointed by the Montreal Committee, with my consent, President of the Church of England Mission to the French-speaking population of British North America: the principal Institution of which is at Sabrevois in this Diocese. This, however, so far from involving any inconsistency on my part, was a proof to the contrary; while, at the same time, it was my wish not to act vexatiously, or in a way injurious to the Mission. The work of the Montreal Committee embraced two objects: 1st. The schools, whether Normal, Model, or Common, within the Diocese; these were simply Diocesan matters, and, excepting a grant from the Parent Society in London, deriving no aid from external sources. 2nd The Mission to the French Canadians, in aid of which subscriptions were received, and collections made in all the Dioceses of B. N. A. It was found that after the Archdeacon's appointment, as General Superintendent, there was some difficulty in carrying on the work of the Mission at Sabrevois, in consequence of the clashing of arrangements made by our Committee, and the deputations we sent out, over which Archdeacon Hellmuth had no control, with those made by him for the general purposes of the Society, and collections taken up by him to be remitted to the Parent Society in London. Upon this subject I wrote a long explanatory letter to the Society in London in July, 1858. And some little time after, in consequence of the anxiety of our Committee, that some arrangement could be made, at the particular request of one of their number, I had an interview with Dr. Hellmuth, who, as well as the members of the Committee, was fully aware of my objection to let him interfere in this Diocese. This interview led to no result at the time; but seeing that I had nothing to do with his authority to act for the rest of B. N. A., and since it was evident that the work of the French Mission would suffer; and, as in reality the two objects of the Committee were quite distinct in their nature, one Diocesan, the other British American, I proposed to the Montreal Committee that they should be placed under the charge of two distinct Boards or Committees; and then I would not object to the General Superintendent acting in connection with the latter, the support of which was very mainly derived from parts of the Province already under his charge, and in the prosperity of which so many from the other Dioceses were interested. This was accordingly so carried out, and has since been continued on the same plan.

Before leaving this subject, I would also notice an allusion which the Archdeacon makes towards the close of his letter to a *Pastoral* issued by me, soon after I came to Canada, against "the Colonial Church and School Society;" "Their rules. (he says) as you no doubt "then thought, clashing with what you considered your Episcopal "authority. Their rules and constitution, I am thankful to say, have not "been, and I trust will never be changed."

Here the Archdeacon has been in error. The objections I made in my pastoral were, 1st. To the conduct of one of the agents, and on this point it turned out that the Parent Society were exactly of the same opinion as myself. 2nd. I objected to a Rule of the Society under which they claimed to send their Agents into whatever places they thought fit. I contended that if I was to act with them, I could be no party to placing any Agent in any Parish or Mission, where there was a clergyman holding my license, without his consent. And after some correspondence had passed on the subject, I received a document, dated June, 1852, signed by the Rev. Mesac Thomas, Secretary to the Parent Society, on behalf of the Committee in London, setting forth "the arrangement between the Lord Bishop of Montreal and the General Committee of the C. C. & S. Society." The 7th article is as follows: "No Catechist or Schoolmaster shall be employed within the local limits of any Clergyman's charge without his consent."

But to pass on to the matter of the church in Sherbrooke Street; and here I must notice an inaccuracy in the account given by the Bishop of Huron of my conversation with him at Kingston. I most certainly did not use any such expression, as that Genl. Evans had "conspired" with Dr. Hellmuth to take me in; nor did I state that I considered that the erection of the proposed building would "in the end prove highly injurious to the Church." I took no objection to the church itself, nor to Dr. Hellmuth, as the incumbent. I am ready to express regret at Gen. Evans' name having been mixed up with the statement; and I should not have mentioned it, except for the purpose of explaining the transaction. I had but one short interview with him; when he certainly declined to give me any statement of his proposal in writing, but I cannot pretend to say that he knew exactly what had been the communication made to me by Dr. Hellmuth. Having promised this, I most unhesitatingly deny the correctness of the Archdeacon's version throughout: certainly, according to his statement, I might, if I thought right, have refused to accede to the proposal, but I could have had no further ground of complaint. I must leave those best acquainted with us both to form their judgment as to what the facts were. At least I can say it is no fault of mine, that I am unable to produce a document in writing, to certify to the exact terms in which the application was made, and I think I may venture to assert that there never was a proposition of the like nature made to any Bishop, of which after repeated applications on three successive days not the slightest memorandum could be obtained in writing. Why was there this reluctance? And again why such secrecy enjoined? It was surely a great public work; and in contradiction to the Archdeacon on this, as on almost every point of detail, I must distinctly assert that I named the Dean and one layman,

whom I should wish to consult before giving an answer, and I was told that I must not mention it to any one. Why again and again was I pressed for an immediate decision? I asked for only a few days delay, which I thought could not be material; as it would take about eighteen months before the church could have been fit for occupation. And here again as to this point the statement of the Archdeacon gives a version entirely new to me. The proposition in fact was simply that Genl. Evans was willing to spend £3 00 for the erection of a church on his property in Sherbrooke Street; not one hint was given about its being only advanced, either with or without interest, or that the land was other than a free gift. There was no difficulty raised as to private patronage: all that I could elicit was that I might settle every thing as I pleased, and make every arrangement, with this proviso, that Dr. Hellmuth was to be the first incumbent. There was a proposition about a service in German, but that was quite a collateral incident, and had nothing to do with the essential merits of the case. The Germans, who happened to be going to present an address to me, on the day of my last interview with the Archdeacon, stated that there were then only about seventy families of them in the city; and therefore, in answer to a question from me, very wisely decided, at that time, against any encouragement being given to a separate German service; thinking it much better that they should all continue, as they were doing, to attend the several English churches and be identified with them. A large immigration, some five or six years after, has since led to the necessity for a separate German service. But so far from their answer affecting the question, I immediately, on their leaving the room, said to the Archdeacon; "Well, you see that part of the plan falls to the ground; but now let us return to the general proposition;" and then it was—and not at the first interview as Dr. Hellmuth asserts, that on third day in consequence of sundry questions put by me in order to try and find out what the proposal really meant, that I was at last informed of the actual terms on which the Church was to be built. And certainly I at once expressed how entirely I had been under a misapprehension during all our negotiations; and upon that ground, put an end to the conference, so that all the Archdeacon has stated on this subject is purely imaginary. Most certainly I knew the terms (as he asserts), upon which the money was to be advanced before I came to a decision, and it was he who communicated that fact to me; but it was thus elicited at the eleventh hour, and was the sole and simple reason of my declining to proceed with the business, which I did directly I was informed upon this point.

The Archdeacon justifies himself in the matter of the Clergyman, whom he eulogized in England, after he had been under censure in Canada, by stating that a considerable time, two years, had elapsed; and that he had much improved during that period, and that therefore it was correct to speak of him as he did. This may be perfectly true; and I most truly rejoice to think it may be so. But as the Archdeacon left for England towards the end, I believe, of September, and the speech in question was made about the middle of November, of course he was in possession of these facts before his departure. I would ask then why as General Superintendent of the Society, he did not take measures to have the Rev. Mr. _____ restored to his proper status, before he left Canada; and

whether the other members of the Society's Committee were not left by him still seeking to enforce the removal ; and were not a little embarrassed and surprised, when they read what had occurred at the meeting in England. Perhaps the Archdeacon knows whether his conduct in this matter has been satisfactory to them.

The Archdeacon complains in connection with a letter from the Bishop of Quebec, published by me, that I had been seeking information against him, while waiting for his reply to my letter to him in England, enquiring as to the truth of the report of his speech at Islington. The fact was that while I was travelling down from Kingston with the Bishop of Quebec, he spoke of what the Archdeacon was reported to have said respecting the Canadian Colleges ; and expressed himself, very nearly as given in his letter. All I did was simply to ask whether he had any objection to send me in writing what he had then said, which he said he would do very willingly.

It was with the full conviction that I had undertaken a most painful task, that I moved at all in this matter ; and have done it solely as a matter of public duty. My only desire has been for the cause of truth ; and if I have used any language that the occasion has not warranted, no one will regret it more than myself.

I remain, Your faithful brother in Christ,

F. MONTREAL.